

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-24 are now pending in the application. Applicant believes the presently amended claims place the application in a condition for allowance, and respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections in view of the remarks herein.

## **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-3, 9, 11, 13, 20, 21, 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Torberg (U.S. Pat. No. 4,757,630). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, the Applicant submits that the above rejection has been rendered moot by the amendments to independent claims 1, 11, and 20, which clarify that the reel is rotatably mounted *within at least a portion of a recess in the buoyant body*, and the reel includes a weight *disposed within the reel* such that the weight resists rotation but does not prevent rotation of the reel within the recess. These features are disclosed in paragraphs [0030], [0032] and [0033] of the specification.

With regard to claims 1, 11 and 20, the Office action states that Torberg discloses an eccentrically weighted reel that resists unwinding of the line from the reel after the anchor hits bottom. However, Torberg discloses a weighted *handle 84 attached to the side of a spool 68* that prevents more anchor line 70 from being released once the anchor has settled. (Column 5 lines 62-68). Torberg does not disclose a reel *rotatably mounted within a recess* in a decoy body, or a weight *disposed within the reel* for resisting rotation of the reel after the anchor hits bottom. The weighted handle 84 of Torberg could not be attached to the side of a reel rotatably mounted within a recess as claimed, because the handle would interfere with rotation of the reel within the recess. The weight in claims 1, 11, and 20 is disposed within the

reel mounted within a recess, and is not anticipated or obvious in view of Torberg, because Torberg does not teach or suggest a reel having an interior in which to mount a weight that will resist but not prevent or interfere with rotation of the reel within a recess. As such, claims 1, 11, and 20 are not anticipated by Torberg, and are allowable.

Furthermore, claim 1 further clarifies that the cranking means is configured to be stowed within the buoyant body to secure the anchor. Paragraph [0006] of the specification states that “through stowage of the integrated cranking means, the anchor is secured”. Paragraphs [0031] and [0032] state that the cranking body 48 can be pushed into a recess 62 in the buoyant body and can engage the recess 62 to resist turning of the reel 26, which accordingly prevents unwinding of the anchor line. Paragraph [0006] of the Specification notes that the cranking means arrangement “allows the anchor line of the decoy to be quickly and easily secured without the use of additional tools or hardware and eliminates springs or other metal components subject to rust and corrosion”. Torberg does not teach a weight *disposed within the reel* that permits rotation of the reel *within a recess*, nor does it teach a cranking means that is moveable to a stowed position in which the anchor is secured. For at least these reasons, the Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentably distinguished over Torberg.

Claims 11 and 20 have also been amended to clarify that the cranking means is moveable to a stowed position in which the anchor is secured, and further clarifies that the cranking means is configured to resist rotation of the reel when the cranking means is pushed into a recess in the buoyant body. These features are neither disclosed nor suggested by Torberg. As such, the Applicant submits that claims 11 and 20 are not anticipated and are patentable over the cited references for these reasons as well.

With regard to claims 2-3, 9, 13, and 21-23, these claims ultimately depend from claims 1, 11, and 20, which applicant believes are allowable in view of the above remarks. As such, Applicant believes claims 2-3, 9, 13, and 21-23 are also allowable for at least these reasons.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 16,17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cherry (U.S. Pat. No. 5,367,813). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to claims 1 and 11, the Office action states that Cherry discloses an eccentrically weighted reel 12 that has eccentrically mounted weights 26, 66, and 68. However, Cherry discloses a reel 12 having a *handle 26, 66, and 68 attached to the side of the reel 12* that is used to dispense the anchor line, and does not teach the use of a weight *disposed within the reel* for resisting rotation of the reel after the anchor hits bottom. Rather, Cherry discloses dispensing a length of anchor line according to the estimated depth of the water, after which a stopper is placed in a locked position to prevent *winding up of the line*. (Column 5, line 50). The weight in claims 1, 11, and 20 is disposed within the reel mounted within a recess, and is not anticipated or obvious in view of Cherry, because Cherry does not teach or suggest a reel having an interior in which to mount a weight that will resist but not prevent rotation of the reel within a recess. The handle 26, 66, and 68 could not be attached to the side of a reel rotatably mounted within a recess as claimed, because the handle would interfere with rotation of the reel within the recess. The Office Action also states that the anchor is sufficient to overcome the eccentric weight, since the weight is removed from the reel prior to removal of line. However, it is not possible to simultaneously have a weight *disposed*

*within a reel* as in claims 1, 11, and 20, and a weight that may be removed prior to unwinding line from the same reel. Removing the weight from within the reel would require the reel to be disassembled, such that the reel would no longer be able to dispense anchor line. Thus, the weight disposed within the reel in claims 1, 11, and 20 As such, claims 1, and 11 are not anticipated by Cherry, and are allowable.

Furthermore, claim 11 further clarifies that the cranking means is configured to resist rotation of the reel when the cranking means is pushed into a recess in the body. This feature is neither disclosed nor suggested by Cherry. As such, the Applicant submits that claim 11 is not anticipated and is patentable over the cited references for at least these reasons.

With regard to claims 2, 4-7, 10, 14, 15-17 and 19, these claims ultimately depend from claims 1 and 11, which applicant believes are allowable in view of the above remarks. As such, Applicant believes claims 2, 4-7, 10, 14, 15-17 and 19are also allowable for at least these reasons.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 4-6 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Torberg (U.S. Pat. No. 4,757,630) in view of Cherry (U.S. Pat. No. 5,367,813). Claims 8 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Torberg (U.S. Pat. No. 4,757,630) in view of Cram (U.S. Pat. No. 811,036). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

At the outset, the Applicant submits that the above rejection has been rendered moot by the amendments to independent claims 1, 11, and 21 to clarify that the reel is rotatably mounted *within a recess*, and the reel includes a weight *disposed within the*

*reel* such that the weight resists rotation but does not prevent rotation of the reel within the recess.

With regard to claims 4-6, 8, 17, and 18 the Office Action states that Torberg shows a reel having an eccentric weight 84, and that it would have been obvious to provide Torberg with a recess for the reel. However, Torberg discloses a weighted handle 84 *attached to the side* of a reel, which could not be rotatably mounted within a recess as claimed because the handle 84 would interfere with rotation of the reel within the recess. The claimed weight disposed within the reel mounted within a recess is not obvious in view of Torberg, because Torberg does not teach or suggest a reel having an interior in which to mount a weight that will resist but not prevent or interfere with rotation of the reel within a recess. As such, claims 4-6 and 17 are not obvious in view of Torberg, Cherry or Cram, and are allowable for at least these reasons.

Neither Cherry or Torberg teach or suggest a reel rotatably mounted within a recess in a decoy body, and a weight being disposed within the reel such that the weight resists rotation but does not prevent rotation of the reel within the recess. This allows the decoy to be launched onto the water and the anchor to self deploy, where the eccentric weight disposed within the reel resists rotation of the reel and unwinding of the line from the reel after the anchor hits lake bottom. Such a reel with an interior space provides for receiving a weight that resists but does prevent rotation of the reel, without having to attach a weight to the outside of the reel that would prevent rotation of the reel within a recess in the decoy. As such, the Applicant submits that the claimed decoys are novel and patentable over the cited references.

## CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (314) 726-7500.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6 SEPT 2005

By:



Bryan K. Wheelock, Reg. No. 31,441

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
7700 Bonhomme, Suite 400  
St. Louis, Missouri 63105  
(314) 726-7500